

5/18/70

Dick, Howard, re Dick's 5/12,13:

Hicks- Sprague can't even write straight. There is another, face-on clear picture of Hicks, who apparently knew nothing but was any eyewitness. If there were the remotest possibility of an serial or radio, do you think JG would not have used it? This idea did originate with Harris, who happened to be there when Hick did wander in. As I recall, Hicks also get himself beaten up at the Fontainbleau, something with black males at 3 a.m. Maybe another "witness", I am not now certain.

359- Weigert requests. Do you now see the point? If Howard would take the time to do what I did poorly, overlay tissue and crace cut for you, I think you'd see. Bullet so packed in cotton no chance abrasion, jiggling.. Residues: this escaped Nichols until he read test case POST MORTEM. Agreed on present status, but under the law, failure to make the test contemporaneously is enough for acquittal.

John: My guess is he plans a big thing to try and claim I violated copyright requirements by not letting him have, which is foolish, but I think like him. Fact is I did let him have, did offer again, but insisted as precondition, following his violation, of his own agreement to abide by law.

Other things noted, no time for response here.

To Howard: I've earlier suggested Wecht is too busy. Leave him alone except when urgent.

Grassy knoll: I've always considered both possible and have never, to my recollection, made reference to the north alone. It does present major problems, but it is as possible and has distinct advantages that, fortunately, escaped Sprague. I disagree that JFK movements indicate either knoll, certainly none at that location indicating a simultaneous movement to his left, which is expectable. They are discontinuous movements, back then over. An argument could be made from head pivoting only, slide by slide comparison, but I think it would be inconclusive. On not figuring straight trajectory after strike, wait until you see what I now have on King. Very true.

When you have time, no rush, and for my Featherstone file, not any special interest in Kent, I'd like more on Ewing and his allegation I didn't believe on other grounds, having seen this live on TV and then rerun several times.

As of now, if I add anything on Bieberdorff to what you initially suggested I think it will be only citation of testimony, not judgement his professional competence. This is the Commission's abdicated responsibility. I think I should just raise the question as clearly as possible, not try and provide my own answers now.

Best,

PS. neither of you spend money copying Sprague. I'm in no hurry to read such stuff and someone may send me a copy. If I do not get, I'll ask.